

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,927		09/26/2001	Thomas Rogers	3391/PCT	1278
26648	7590	01/28/2004		EXAM	INER
PHARMA	CIA CO	RPORATION	LUKTON, DAVID		
GLOBAL P POST OFFI		DEPARTMENT 1027	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ST. LOUIS,	MO 6	3006		1653	
				DATE MAILED: 01/28/200-	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			•
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/963,927	ROGERS ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		David Lukton	1653
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this commun r Reply	cation appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failure - Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOMALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI sions of time may be available under the provisions GIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30 period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply processed by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a nunication. 0) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thir attutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI will, by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <u>21 October 2002</u> .	
2a)[This action is FINAL . 2	b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
	Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the praction		
Disposition	on of Claims		
5) 6) 7)	la) Of the above claim(s) is/ar Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> are subject to restriction		
Application			·. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
9)[] 7	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.	
10)[]	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to	by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any object	• ,	• •
			y(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. Note the attached	a Office Action or form P10-152.
	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		0.440() ()) (0
a)[_ _* S	application from the Internation ee the attached detailed Office action	documents have been received. documents have been received in A of the priority documents have been nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). n for a list of the certified copies not	Application No I received in this National Stage
sir 37		d in the first sentence of the specific	eation or in an Application Data Sheet.
14)[] A	cknowledgment is made of a claim for ference was included in the first sent	or domestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
Attachment	(s)		•
_	of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)
	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Pation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pation Disclosure Statement(s)	·	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. §121:

- I. Claims 1-5, drawn to compounds.
- II. Claims 6-7, drawn to methods.

The claimed inventions are distinct.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)). However, in the event that Group I is elected, and claims therein found allowable, the corresponding method-of-use claims will be rejoined for further examination (subject to the same limitations on the compounds).

Applicant is advised that for the response to this requirement to be complete, an election of the invention to be examined must be indicated, even if the requirement is traversed (37 C.F.R. 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to

Serial No. 09/963,927 Art Unit 1653

final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

In addition to the foregoing, applicants are required under 35 U.S.C. §121 to elect a disclosed specie for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. A "specie", in this case, is a specific compound with all substituent variables fully accounted for.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a generic claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are witten in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentable distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 of the other invention.

Serial No. 09/963,927 Art Unit 1653

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lukton whose telephone number is 571-272-0952. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached at 571-272-0951.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

PATENT EXAMINEM GROLE 1800